

Application No. 10/711,403  
Technology Center 1775  
Amendment dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated February 20, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 21 2007

### REMARKS

As of the filing of the present Office Action, claims 1-20 were pending in the above-identified US Patent Application. In the Office Action, a rejection under 35 USC §103 was maintained against all claims on the basis of U.S. Patent No. 5,891,584 to Coffinberry et al. (Coffinberry) in view of Japanese Patent No. 356030514A to Hikino et al. (Hikino) and EP 0304176 A2 to Priceman.

In response, Applicants have amended the claims as set forth above. More particularly, claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended to incorporate limitations from dependent claims 18 and 20 (which are canceled without prejudice), namely, one or both of the outermost layers 18/28 consists of platinum.

Applicants believe that the above amendments do not present new matter. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of remaining claims 1-17 and 19 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Application No. 10/711,403  
Technology Center 1775  
Amendment dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated February 20, 2007

### **Rejection under 35 USC §103**

As now amended, the claims require that the outermost layer (18,28) of at least one of the coating systems (14,24) consists of platinum, as previously required by canceled claims 18 and 20. In the Office Action, the Examiner commented on the prior use of "consisting essentially of" in claims 1, 6, and 9, but not the use of "consist of" as required by claims 18 and 20. Applicants believe this difference patentably distinguishes their outermost coatings 18 and 28 from Hikino, since Hikino requires "a layer 1 . . . made of an incomplete mixture of at least one catalyst for oxidative destruction of tar . . . and an inorganic binder," and the Examiner has not established that the inorganic binder is an optional constituent of Hikino's layer 1. Because neither Coffinberry nor Priceman teach or suggest this limitation, Applicants believe that independent claims 1 and 9 and their remaining dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record.

Application No. 10/711,403  
Technology Center 1775  
Amendment dated May 21, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated February 20, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 21 2007

**Closing**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that their patent application be given favorable reconsideration.

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,



Domenica N.S. Hartman  
Reg. No. 32,701

May 21, 2007  
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383  
TEL.: (219) 462-4999  
FAX: (219) 464-1166